

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANA VENTURA,)	Case No. CV 24-9477 FMO (KESx)
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
WIMATEX, INC.,)	ORDER DISMISSING ACTION WITHOUT
Defendant.)	PREJUDICE

On March 5, 2025, the court issued its Standing Order Re: Disability Cases (see Dkt. 10, Court's Order of March 5, 2025), which ordered plaintiff to file a proof of service demonstrating service of the Complaint on all parties "within 93 days of the filing of the case absent a previously approved extension of time by the court." (Id. at 2). The court admonished plaintiff that "failure to file the proof of service within 93 days after the filing of the case shall result in the dismissal of the action and/or the defendant that has not appeared in the case and for which plaintiff has not filed a proof of service." (Id.) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 1388 (1962)).

Here, plaintiff filed this action on November 1, 2024. (See Dkt. 1, Compl.). Accordingly, plaintiff was required to file a proof of service demonstrating service of the complaint no later than February 3, 2025. (See Dkt. 10, Court's Order of March 5, 2025, at 2); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). No such proof of service has been filed as of the date of this Order. (See, generally, Dkt.).

Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a court, on its own initiative, "must dismiss the action without prejudice" if service is not effected "within 90 days after the

1 complaint is filed[.]” In addition, a district court may dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or
2 to comply with court orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-
3 30, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962) (authority to dismiss for failure to prosecute necessary to avoid undue
4 delay in disposing of cases and congestion in court calendars); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258,
5 1260 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 915, 113 S.Ct. 321 (1992) (district court may dismiss action
6 for failure to comply with any court order). Dismissal, however, is a severe penalty and should be
7 imposed only after consideration of the relevant factors in favor of and against this extreme
8 remedy. Thompson v. Housing Auth. of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir.1986). These
9 factors include: “(1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need
10 to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less
11 drastic alternatives; and (5) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits.”
12 Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61); see
13 Applied Underwriters, Inc. v. Lichtenegger, 913 F.3d 884, 891 (9th Cir. 2019) (“By its plain text,
14 a Rule 41(b) dismissal . . . requires ‘a court order’ with which an offending plaintiff failed to
15 comply.”). “Although it is preferred, it is not required that the district court make explicit findings
16 in order to show that it has considered these factors and [the Ninth Circuit] may review the record
17 independently to determine if the district court has abused its discretion.” Ferdik, 963 F.2d at
18 1261.

19 Pursuant to Rules 4(m) and 41(b), and in light of the Pagtalunan factors, the court is
20 persuaded that this action should be dismissed for failure to effect service within the specified time
21 and comply with the Court’s Order of March 5, 2025. Plaintiff’s failure to timely file a proper and
22 legally sufficient proof of service hinders the court’s ability to move this case toward disposition
23 and indicates that plaintiff does not intend to litigate this action. In other words, plaintiff’s
24 “noncompliance has caused [this] action to come to a complete halt, thereby allowing [her] to
25 control the pace of the docket rather than the Court.” Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990
26 (9th Cir. 1999) (internal quotation marks omitted). Further, plaintiff was warned that failure to file
27 a valid proof of service would result in a dismissal of the action for lack of prosecution and failure
28 to comply with a court order. (See Dkt. 10, Court’s Order of March 5, 2025, at 2); see also Ferdik,

1 963 F.2d at 1262 (“[A] district court’s warning to a party that his failure to obey the court’s order
2 will result in dismissal can satisfy the consideration of alternatives requirement.”) (internal
3 quotation marks omitted). Thus, having considered the Pagtalunan factors, the court is persuaded
4 that the instant action should be dismissed for failure to timely effect service, failure to comply with
5 a court order, and failure to prosecute.

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that judgment be entered dismissing this action,
7 without prejudice, for failure to timely effect service, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with
8 the orders of the court.

9 Dated this 18th day of March, 2025.

10 /s/
Fernando M. Olguin
United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28